

**Mission Bay Landfill
Technical Advisory Committee
City Administration Building
12th Floor Conference Room B
March 25, 2004
9:00 to 12:00**

Meeting Minutes

TAC Members Present

Donna Frye
John Wilks
Ben Leaf

Jeoffry Gordon
Frank Gormlie
Dave Huntley

Bruce Reznik
Robert Curtis
Robert Tukey

Alternate TAC Members Present

Richard Miller

Ellen Shively

Tony Williams

TAC Members Absent

Michael Zucchet
David Kennedy

Ann de Peyster.
Rebecca Lafreniere

Judy Swink
Brian McDaniel

Interested Parties/Alternates

Patrick Owen
John Fields

Bob Gutzler
Jay Jones

Scott Andrews
Jace Miller

Staff

Chris Gonaver
Ray Purtee

Steven Fontana
Adam Wexler

Sylvia Castillo

The meeting was called to order by Councilmember Frye. Self introductions were made. A quorum was present.

February meeting minutes were reviewed and approved with two corrections- spelling of "Brian McDaniel" and Mr. Richard Miller was not present.

Adam Wexler handed out and read Councilmember Zucchet's letter to the TAC. A motion was made to accept Councilmember Zucchet's letter and resignation as co-chair of the TAC. The motion was seconded and approved.

Dr. Tukey introduced himself to the group and briefly described his background in the health sciences. He was welcomed by all.

Councilmember Frye stated that we may be close to having a new geologist to join the group and she will keep us posted.

Comments collected to date on the draft work plan were distributed to the group. The issue of postponing the deadline for comments to the work plan was brought up. Councilmember Frye felt that this subject should be discussed and voted on by the group and reminded everyone how long it has taken us to get to this point in our project.

Dr. Jay Jones spoke on the draft work plan prepared by SCS Engineers. They wrote the work plan with the goal of striking a balance between technical versus easy reading. He emphasized four general points in reviewing the comments to the work plan:

1. Primary focus should be getting out to the field to start the work
 - some comments directly address the work plan and these should be focused on in today's meeting
 - other comments addressing the historical background and final results and will be considered after today's meeting
2. Every comment must be in writing so that the comment and response can be documented
3. The work plan's scope of work is limited by the amount of money available- any additions to the field work must include a subtraction
4. The regulatory agencies are driving the work plan process and we need to obtain their approval.

The local regulatory agencies reviewing the work plan are the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the Local Enforcement Agent (LEA) of the Integrated Waste Management Board. The work plan will be submitted to them with all comments, a health and safety plan and a letter requesting their approval to go forth with the field work. A "ballpark" estimate is that the comment responses could be turned around in a week.

Councilmember Frye reminded the group to think about a cut off date for comments. A date that would allow documents to move forward to the regulatory agencies so that work could proceed. We should focus today on prioritizing comments so that we can cover the ones important to the regulatory agencies.

Dr. Jones started with the review of the comments to the work plan. In response to the LEA comments concerning evaluating offsite gas migration, SCS will relocate some gas sampling probes to outside the landfill footprint. In response to the APCD's comment that 50 gas sampling probes was excessive, SCS's professional judgement is that this number of probes is needed to adequately characterize the landfill's gas generation.

A question was asked "Why is there no trenching in the work plan?"

Dr. Jones answered that the goal of characterizing the landfill mass can be accomplished with the push pull probes and the landfill gas characterization. It is his professional judgement that the sampling program outlined in the work plan is sufficient to perform the site assessment. Trenching was performed in the Woodward Clyde study of 20 years ago and their report describes what was found. Additional trenching isn't necessary. Big issues to overcome with trenching are health and safety and the potential to cause a release from the landfill.

Dr. Huntley agreed and stated that collecting a point sample of waste is only a “point” sample, but collecting a water sample that’s been slowly moving thru the waste for fifty years can give characterization of a larger waste mass. He would like to see more sampling aimed at down gradient locations from the waste mass.

Dr. Jones responded that some data from previous studies will be used to help characterize the landfill and there is a general bias in the work plan to focus on down gradient samples. These sampling locations could change after the geophysical results are in to focus on down gradient locations. It was agreed that if the work plan were to be revised as a result of field investigations (for example thru geophysics), then the TAC, the City, and regulatory agencies would be notified.

A question was asked “What will be the depth of the water sampling wells? Dr. Jones responded that they will be shallow wells. A discussion ensued concerning how background contamination levels would be established. Dr. Jones stated that if a chemical is found it will be added to the health risk; in other words whatever is found at the site will be used in establishing the health risks. This is the most conservative approach. It was pointed out that this method may not give enough information to lead to a conclusion that the landfill was the source of the contaminant.

There was discussion on the EPA models to be used in calculating health risks. The Reasonable Maximum Exposure (RME) model will give results not less than the actual exposure and is almost a “worst case” scenario. But this is not the strictest standard when compared to the “Precautionary Principal” model or a zero tolerance model. Also, there could be threats to biological organisms from contaminant levels that pose no threats to humans, but biological health threat standards are not as established as human health threat standards. EPA models and chemical lists are individual in nature, but in the actual world combining exposures could be lethal.

A motion was made, seconded, and approved to make changes to the work plan concerning predicting health effects based on risks. To page 98, section 6.31, the last paragraph will be eliminated and replaced with a precautionary principal paragraph drafted by Dr. Gordon to the effect of “two chemicals combining can be dangerous and EPA models have limitations.”

Dr. Jones went over Chuck Budinger’s comments:

1. acknowledged
2. acknowledged
3. already addressed in work plan
4. chromium will be included
5. SCS will be looking up and down gradient. Out side contaminants will not be written off except perhaps MTBE.
6. there are gas probes and separate soil probes
7. Yes
8. No
9. Yes

To the question “Is the budget sufficient to do the site assessment?” Dr. Jones responded yes, it is sufficient.

Councilmember Frye reminded the group that the remaining time in the meeting should be used to address those specific issues that are very important to the work plan.

In response to a question on chemical concentration standards Dr. Jones stated that tables of EPA PRG's (Preliminary Remediation Goals) will be included in the work plan.

Sylvia Castillo acknowledged that the site assessment report would be sent to the Federal EPA. The EPA has stated that they would review the site assessment results.

Bob Gutzler said that if there are any historical documents that people want in the final report such as the EPA's superfund ranking, then get such documents to Chris Gonaver.

To the comment that landfill toxics can be found in other areas of Mission Bay, Dr. Jones acknowledged that analysis of groundwater and soil vapor data could lead to discovery of wastes further out from the presently known landfill boundaries.

A comment was made that the history portion of the work plan does not cite the actual dumping of toxic wastes in the landfill and that such a statement should be added.

To the question "Will there be investigation underneath the Sea World parking lot where historical photos showed drying ponds?" Dr. Jones responded no, that area is off the landfill footprint.

To the question "Shouldn't sediment test points shown as red triangles in the work plan map be positioned so as to indicate whether higher contaminant concentrations occur as one gets closer to the landfill?" Dr. Jones responded that buried sediments are considered immobile and can be influenced by what's coming from rainfall, storm drains and surface runoff. SCS will revisit these locations after data starts coming in from the field reconnaissance.

Judy Swink pointed out that there are two appendices labeled "C" and that perhaps they should be labeled "C1" and "C2." Also, she appreciates the readability of the report and the comments of all the TAC members.

A motion was made, seconded, and approved to instruct SCS to send the work plan with comments to the local regulatory agencies for approval for field work to begin.

Councilmember Frye clarified that even though field work may start soon, there is no cut off date for comments and more comments are encouraged to the work plan's historical analysis, field test results, final conclusions, etc.

The draft handbill to be distributed at local community groups was reviewed and will be re-drafted for TAC review before it is released.

Chris announced that the APCD will conduct their ambient air monitoring of the site starting April 13th.

Items for next agenda

-status of work by SCS

Future Meetings

- Friday, April 30th, 10:00 am to 12:00 pm, 3rd Fl Conference Room A, City Admin. Building